

fr



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,178	01/03/2001	Robert Paul Morris	P211/1975P	2820

29141 7590 05/13/2004
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
P O BOX 51418
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

VU, VIET DUY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

fr

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/754,178

Applicant(s)

MORRIS, ROBERT PAUL

Examiner

Viet Vu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2154

1. The current title is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Art Rejections:

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheridan, U.S. pat. No. 5,760,917 and further in view of Haverstock et al, U.S. pat. No. 6,434,607.

Per claims 1-2, Sheridan discloses a system and method for providing controlled access to digital images comprising:

a) defining metadata elements for an image, e.g., IDs, formats and/or other related descriptive information (see col 7, lines 1-18 and col 9, lines 48-66),

b) associating users who will access the images with access rights and associating access rights to individual image and its metadata elements (col 4, line 48 - col 5, line 18),

Art Unit: 2154

- c) receiving a request for access to the images and the metadata elements by a user,
- d) determining user's access right from the request to determine which metadata to make available to the user (see col 5, lines 46-64).

Sheridan does not teach using roles to manage access rights to the images. The use of roles-based system to control access to documents and/or each individual field within a document is well known in the art as disclosed by Haverstock (see Haverstock's col 5, line 56 - col 6, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sheridan with such role-based controlled access system because it would have provided better control of access to the secured data files in the network (see Haverstock's col 3, lines 1-17).

Per claims 3-8, Sheridan also teaches allowing the user to specify allowable actions for each image and/or set of images and/or its metadata elements (see Sheridan's col 4, line 65 - col 5, line 6).

Claims 9-33 are similar in scope as that of claims 1-8 and hence are rejected for the same rationale set forth above for claims 1-8.

Art Unit: 2154

Conclusion:

4. The references cited by the examiner on PTO-892 but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu whose telephone number is 703-305-9597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached on (703) 305-8498.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600. The Group fax number is 703-872-9306.



VIET D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2154
5/12/04